


1 the merits, and (2) the ability of the Plaintiff to state his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the
2 legal issues involved. *See Rand v. Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997). Neither the need for
3 discovery, nor the fact the *pro se* litigant would be better served with the assistance of counsel require a
4 finding of exceptional circumstances. *Id.* Both of the exceptional circumstances factors must be
5 considered together before reaching a decision. *See Rand*, 113 F.3d at 1525; *Terrell*, 935 F.2d at 1017;
6 *Wilborn*, 789 F.2d at 1331.

7 In light of the early stage of the proceedings with no answer from Defendants on file, the Court
8 cannot make a determination on Plaintiff's likelihood of success on the merits of his failure to supervise
9 and medical indifference claims. The Court does note, however, mere negligence in treating a medical
10 condition, without more, does not constitute deliberate indifference under the Eighth Amendment.
11 *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1131 (9th Cir. 2000).

12 After careful consideration of the initial pleadings in this case, the Court finds the issues
13 involved are not particularly complex and plaintiff has thus far been able to adequately present his
14 claims. The Court does not find exceptional circumstances exist to warrant appointment of counsel at
15 this time. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel is **DENIED without prejudice**.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 DATED: September 23, 2010

18 
19 Hon. William McCurine, Jr.
20 U.S. Magistrate Judge
21 United States District Court
22
23
24
25
26
27
28